p livered in the House of Representatives, February 28, 1859, (Mr. Bocock in the chair.)

privered in the House of Representatives, February 28, 4859 (Mr. Boccex in the chair.)

Mr. Chairman: It is a peculier tendency of seems minds to accept, as facts, foregone conclusions which, otherwise defined by the essence of things, frequently come to defined us with the mercet varieth of truth. Among these eats of faith which the mind is so prone to perform, I may well be allowed to include the general belief that the direct mission of Christianity went beyond the redemption of souls, and that, breaking the fetters of bondage, it was intended to clevate the stave to an equality, which derives its possibilities from the brains only of modern fanaticism, skillfully egged on by political knavery. It sir, on past occasions, and in the remarks which have deemed it proper to make in defence of the institution of slavery, in the sense that it violates no law of Christ and involves no commission of sin, I baye not gone astray from the lawful scope of those remarks, or mistraken the teachings of the Gospei; then may I boldly assert that, as Christianity never condenses so neither did it abolish slavery, through the application of society. It was its boast, on the contrary, that it could fitly harmonize with the mass of social interests, which it dound in existence when it was organisms. The proclamation of Christianity, therefore, called for no abolition, by virtue of any superior right, of the forms of government; nor did it produce any sudden revulsions in the established order of things. If, according to the teachings of St. Paul to the Galatians—a doctrine which, I think, I have strictly explained—there be an equality among men, that equality does not extend to the co-ordinations of human socarty. Its is drawn in the eye of God, who has said "My

In order, sir, that there might be no doubt on this subject, the same Apostle, training the Corinthians, who, as Greeks, were the owners of slaves, and who, as neophytes, might have harbored some scruples—the same Apostle, I say, training them to the knowledge of spiritual giffs, heralds, as it were, his teachings to the Galatians by the declaration to the Corinthians that "By one spirit are they all baptized unto one body, whether they be sews or cientiles—whether they be send or free." The very illustration which he uses to enforce his teaching and its meaning forclays the ground which I have occupied in repelling the sophisms of a Christianity condemning slavery into sin. The teaching of the Apostle, sir, is that the influence of the spirit of faith reduces all the discrepant elements into one body for the reception and exercise of spiritual gifts; but the discriminations between the various members of the body are clearly retained, and the necessity of their relative uses elegantly enforced. It is the wissiom of the pagan Agrippa, made holy by the breath of Divine inspiration, speaking through the lips of the Apostle Faut.

Lefore God, therefore, and him only, according to the earliest Christian doctrine, are men equal; and in him are found the sources of a freedom not human—the spirit-

Sefore God, therefore, and him only, according to the carliest Christian doctrine, are men equal; and in him are found the sources of a freedom not human—the spiritual freedom which Paul defines as the "liberty of the sons of God." Thus, then, Christianity deferred to the arrangements of the social organism, which it found existing on its advent. Society was then, as it is now, a great body, each member of which has its own special use and assignment—an organization in which each one is commanded, by the Master himself, to excupy his station and parform his task. In that organization, among the other integral elements, the Apostle found the slave; but neither in the name of his Divine Master, nor by virtue of his mission of truth, did he withdraw the slave from the obligations of the general, social scheme. The

promulgation of the soul-saving law; whilst equality metely was proclaimed in the right to, and in the participation of, those spiritual gifts which are assurances of the salvation of souls, whether they live and believe and pray, in the body of the master or of the slave; whether the slave was one of our own race, as he then existed, with the superior organization, which we claim and vindicate; or whether he be, as now, the black barbarian, redeemed from the savagism of Attica, and through the noviceship of domestic slavery, inducted into the humanising arts of life and trained to the very knowledge of spiritual things, which leads to the salvation of souls.

Now, in the act of making its proclamation, Christianity, as I have already shown, neither assended, repudiated, nor condemned any of the distinctions which society had seen fit to establish—and, by inference, whatever it may now have established—but, on the contrary, its voice, abordine rema, down to the present day, commands obedience to the order of things and enjoins "tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; and honor to whom honor." This, I take it, sir, is the real spirit in which the original Christian faith prescribes its rules of conductor man, so long as social distinctions, that is, so long as society itself shall continue to exist. It may, and I am free and bold enough to declare it, it does bring the master and the slave up to the Maker on a footing of equality when it comes to the save of the soul. But, far from up to the Maker on a footing of equality when it comes to the scrutinies of the soul. But, far from condemning the lawful distinction and the comecrated right as between the master and the slave, it does, in the name of that Maker, sanction the distinction, recognise the right and demand kindness from the one, and from the other obedience. This, sir, is the whole and defined extent of the apostolic teachings on this subject of slavery. Beyond that, the Gospel, which those apostles were commissioned to teach and expound, far from condemning slavery, supplies for it, on the contrary, a prep and a stay as an institution of society, not repudiated, not reproved, but actually admitted by the scheme of the substitution of mankind! A self-consistent Christian, holess he be "in the bonds of ignorance," has no right, therefore, to condemn slavery as something reprehensible in the religious point of view. He cannot declare it at war with the mandate of God without declaring himself, ipso facto, wiser and holier than the God who instituted it by the silence, at least, of the New Testament, which is the record of that law fulfilled in its essence!

Hence there is no teaching of the Apostles, there is no decision of the Church which they reared—I mean, tir, the Church which existed when there was none other that could pretend to decide—which has declared the tenure of slaves to be sinful, whether per se or in relation to the utterances of God's law. Unless I mistake, Mr. Chairman, the normal rule of the Church has ever been: "In necessariae unitar; in dubius libertay in omnubus chariae." A magnificent rule, sir, which I should be glad to see

Chairman, the normal rule of the Church has ever been:

"In necessiris unitas; in dubias libertus; in consultar charitas."

A magnificent rule, sir, which I should be glad to see applied to the wielding of our political trust. But, whether or not applied by us, that unity you find among the Apostles; you find it in those who followed them, and you find that it has not been departed from, so far as slavery is concerned. On the contrary, I have amply, and I trust victoriously, shown how it was treated and understood by those who were immediately sont by the Saviour as heartalks of his law and of his creed.

But, Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the diversities and discidences of the day, I maintain that, as the truth of the docttine of Christianity is one and essential, so was its application in the origin, and in the course of time, one and essential. It will now therefore be mine, in the pursuit of my object, to endeavor to show what was held in reference to slavery by the earliest expounders and defenders of

of my object, to endeavor to show what was held in refer-ence to slavery by the earliest expounders and defenders of the Christian faith. Should you follow, sir, the application and sequel of that doctrine during the ages which wit-nessed the establishment of the Church—should you ex-amine its usages and practice—you will find them all converging into testimony against the innovations of our times. Inquire into the teachings of the successive trus-ters of the new faith, when it had eased to lurk in the dark torners, or had emerged from the crypts and the quarries, to stand face to face with the institutions of the empire, if not to supply one of the elements—the only one, inif not to supply one of the elements—the only one, in-deel—of its moral power; and they will answer our re-tailest of political Christianity to their confusion, if their hardihood can be confounded, as well as to, their shame, if they have retained that distinctive attribute of man-

It was the champions of that church, sir, who, resting on the Gospel of their Master, settled the canons of the carly faith and dectrine, which some of our "cleventh-bour" men now ignore, if not repudiate, because they protest against their nulledy passions and pharisale cant. For the former against the latter, I may, at least, claim the benoît of the axiom of human law: prior qui tempere, poter alle in jure. Their priority of possession, in time, is a warrant, at least, for their priority of possession.

## The Washington Union.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."

VOL. XIV. NO. 271.

WASHINGTON CITY, THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1859.

forgetful of the declaration of the Divine Master, the Roman world—that, sir, had got to be the whole world—the Roman world—that, sir, had got to be the whole world—the Roman world. I say, unheeding his words, "My kingdom is not of this world," deemed that he had come to overturn the existing order and substitute for it a material organization of power. As St Paul had been as sailed with questions, all looking to a supposed change in the social order, and affecting the relations of husband and wife, of purent and child, of man and woman, of inaster and slave, in the arrangement of human, legal society, so were his successors plied, in the course of time, with inquiries all tending to the same ends for decision. Hence you find the good Bishop of Antioch, among the auxious inquiries of his flock, adverting to this question of domestic slavery, writing to Polycarp, and, through him, recommending to the Christian slaves, by whom he was surrounded, just as St. Paul had done to those of his missionary provinces, to be obedient to their masters in the flesh, and still more faithfully and assiduously to serve, for the very reason that they are Bellever, in the faith. I ask yon, sir, to him the import of his words. As the slaves believe—cum crediderint—so the sure aim they bound to serve their masters in the flesh—plus dominis carnations service debere. And where, sir, do you find this imperative command? Is it in the delivery of mere human opinions, which may, or may not, work conviction in the human soul? Why, sir, it is in a book of testimonies, drawn up by one of the original teachers of the faith; drawn up by one of the original teachers of the faith; drawn up by one of the master's lips.

Proceeding in this inquiry, which, I repeat, is intended to show that our northern anti-Christs are perveters of the Saviour proclaim slavery to be a sin, I find, in the middle of the second century, a legion of missionaries starting from the shores of Asia Minor; from those

is whether in existed, and vinnard vinnard vinbarkarian, cough the leading from the shores of Asia Minor; from those shores where the teachings of the true creed had been delivered by St. Paul to the firstlings of the Christian faith. I find them, sir, coming out of the people, whem John the Evangelist, at a later period, addressed without rebuke, if not in praise, for that they were one of the two congregations that had received and still retained the doctrines of truth. I find them coming from the very spot where Irenaeus had been trained to the knowledge of that truth of whom to whom to whom to whom to whom the shores of the Christian church, in all its relations with social life, wending their way from the shores of the Enxine and the Ægean to the fastnesses of Western Gaul, to pull down the dolmen of the druid, and rear in its stead the altar of God l—to dispel the falsehoods of heathenism and fash the lights of Christianity. For that purpose, sir, they went to those provinces in which the general powers of Rome pressed in every form of enormity. Provinces in which the institution of Roman bondage—a fearful system, sir, I am free to confesse exhibited its harshest features in the right of conquest and the usage of slavery combined. These missionaries—not like our northern fanatics, mis-ionaries of hate, insubordination, and bloodshed; but missionaries of love, duty, and obedience—we find, sir, preaching self-denial and patience to the conquered tribes. To the rural slaves we find them holding up the duty of oberuml slaves we find them holding up the duty of obedience in the name of the Redcemer. Those men were
his representatives. They could not, sir, disparage the
essence of their mission, nor belie the truth of the doctrine, which they had traditionally received from his divinely unerring lips. The testimony of history is still
extant to tell us that those provinces of both Cisalpine
and Transalpine Gaul swarmed with herds of pauper,
and multitudes of slaves—slaves, so recognised both by
the pre-existing usages of the tribe and the subsequent
law of conquest. And these, sir, in contact with few,
very few, provincial masters, the majority of whom were the pre-existing usages of the tribe and the subsequent law of conquest. And these, sir, in contact with few, very few, provincial masters, the majority of whom were actually emancipated slaves themselves! They greedily clustered around the strange heralds of a strange creed to them. The hopes of that creed—the promises of its advation—were tendered to them. But nothing was taught them that could affect their so-cial condition, which it was not within the scope of the divine mission to touch. They clustered around these "heaven-alighted" heralds of spiritual weal. We have, sir, the record of the history of those days for the fact that they asked easement from their estate of bondage; and you have, sir, the answer also of those men of peace and justice. The early representative of that Church, which claims that it cannot err, because it claims to be under the guidance and the presence of its founder—one of the living and successive echoes of the teachings of the Apostle Peter, caught from the lips of that founder, and of the Apostle Paul, miraculously initiated into the secrets of His will—Irenaeus has but one answer, like St. Paul's, for their auxious inquirings: Server, cina crediderint, plus dominis carnalibus service delere."

Slaves i for the very reason that you are believers—for the very reason that you have been redeemed from the labeliance of carcadiant. cos, cion credicient, plus dominis carnalibus servire debre."
Slaves i for the very reason that you are believers—for the very reason that you have been redeemed from the darkness of paganism—for that very reason are you still more bound to tribute service to your masters! And, sir, is this a new doctrine of Irenews! Were the ears of the Galilic slaves the first that had ever been addressed by this doctrine of submission, involved in the doctrine of truth! Why, sir, a century had scarcely gone by when to the Ephesians, to the Galatians, to the Colinthians—nay, to the very pastors of the churches and missionaries of the faith—that doctrine had been proclaimed and enjoined by St. Peter and St. Paul, lost, in the words of the latter, "the name of God should be blasphemed!" Why, sir, go to the conventions—go to the pulpits, or to whatever place in which our "covenanting carles" exult in their saturnalia of pseudo-Christianity—preclaim this doctrine, faught, maintained, and enforced by the immediate recipients and the expounders of the faith, and our modern improvers of its teachings would not. I have little doubt, hesitate to denounce Peter and Paul as perverters, if, indeed, they should abstain from the blasphemy of charging the Saviour with imposture!

And yet, sir, were slavery a sin, as our traducers pretend it to be—were it, and had it been, a violation of the commandments of the law of grace—nover, since the days of the Master himself healing the slave of the Cen-

they, have been called to the knowledge of divine truth; and we, as its messengers, declare to you that that divine truth charges you to refuse them service and obedience, because the service given and the obedience claimed are violations of the law of God, and sin committed in his sight." Was that the snswer, Mr. Chairman! Happily, sir, the voice which, pealing above the roar of wild beasts in the arena of Lyons, praised God it he had "brought his servant to the knowledge and teaching of truth;" the voice of the holy martyr, Ireneus, joining in the concert of nine thousand other Christian voices of masters and slaves singing the peans of martyrdom, still rings through the lapse of seventeen hundred years this answer to those who hypocritically descant on the slavery sin of the South: Serves, can credderist, plus dominate carabibus service discressives, as you are believers, the greater your duty to serve your masters in the fl. h.

You cannot, sir, open a single page of the history of those days, which P. the feels not only of modern history, but the baptismal record, also, of all modern society, without finding testimonials of this kind. According to St. Hilarius, a truly religious man is to take no account of the condition of freedom or of slavery; whilst he makes no distinction of bondage, but that of the soul in sin. Slavery, therefore, not as understood and judged by the vulgar, is but an empty name, which may deceive the herd only as to the relative condition of master and slave. It is a mere accident of life—a fact which may be set among those things which are immateral in themselves—things that may be good or bad in accordance only with the disposition of the spirit of those who are submitted to its trials and its requirements. God, if they obey the injunctions of the Saviour, speaking through the Aposiles. End, if they resist the mandate, in the resisting of which lie the disregard of the law and the guilt of sin? Now, sir, do you find a word in this which goes to make slavery sin? No doubt it is an i

Another one, sir, and one of even greater authority, if there can be relative degrees of authority upon an essential traft, the great Rasil, enforcing the example of St Paul returning One-simus to Philemon, prescribes to hiclergy to admonish and amend the slaves who take refuge in monasteries, and to return them to their master's authority. To the slaves themselves, by the seventy-fourth of his rules, he enjoins the duty of obedience dominic canalibus to their masters in the flesh. In others of his dogmatic writings, having special reference to matters of faith, the great doctor does not scruple to invest his reasoning in the formulas of Aristotle, and to proclaim—what? That slavery is a curse and a sin. Why, sir, that "it is useful and profitable to him, who from inferiority of faculties, has not within himself the means of self-guidance, and requires it from abler hands."

The discovery of the control of the teachings of any

means of self-guidance, and requires it from abler hands."

Th., though more radical than the teachings of any of the other fathers, Augustine and Ambrose, perhaps, excepted, is strictly in keeping with their lessons, that looked to the emancipation of souls from the bonds of sin and not to the enfranchisement of slaves from the master's rights. We find another example, sir, derived from the same doctor; one which, although not presented in a didactic form, is not the less significant of his tenets on the nature of slavery and the character of the slave. Intuitively questioned by Simplicia, an Arian lady, who called him to account for some of his opinions—his very dictum, it may be, on the subject of slavery—the eminent Bishop tells her: "My discourses are not such as you deem them. God will be my judge. If witnesses be required, let no slaves be brought forward against me. People of that condition shall not stand at the judgment seat; but virtuous and perfect men, who shall see in reality what is might well borrow the vindications of the learned doctor and equally pure saint to answer the impertinences of the pantalooned Simplicias of the North! I would naturally expect them to pervert the true doctrine, speaking through his lips, and assail a character which still splendors with all the beauty of primitive virtue. Well, let them, if they shoose. What the reasoning of a Wolf might be against an originally-appointed shepherd of the flock I will not stop to inquire. Yet it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it might not, by comparison, disparage the logic of our meck northern friends, who assume to them selves the exclusive wardship of the American Christian flock, to howl denunciations against the other pastors who flock, to howl denunciations against the other pastors who have guided their sheep in the spirit of truth that has lawfully come down to them. As they now denounce us of the South, who maintain that slavery is neither imenough to suspect that they have stealthily clambered to contrive mischief and suggest bloodshed in the Master's

However this may prove, Mr. Chairman, I find additional reasons for its probability in the accumulation of irresistible testimony, which rises out of this inquiry, provoked by the repeated slanders of our adversaries. I find another expounder of the carly faith of the Christian church, as one of the body of heralds and teachers of the Gospel, the promises and reaches of which are bound only by the durations of eternity. Him I find a profound thinker, a faithful bishop—a man of a fair-reaching intellect, of inflexible justice, and of saintly purity. In that man, sir, in St. Ambrose of Milan, I find a like identity, a like coherence of doctrine on this subject of slavery, as handed down to him by the apostles through his predecessors. Slavery is one of the conditions of life; but it is no yiolation of the law of God. It is a hard estate; but it is no god the conditions of the law of God. It is a hard estate; is no yiolation of the law of God. It is a hard estate; but it is no destroying sin. Far from it; St. Ambrose holds that it may be an useful necessity. You have heard, sir, one of the lights of the castern church, St. Basil, declaring that inferiority of faculties makes bondage profitable to the slave. Listen now to an equally great head of the western church, in perfect accord, and in consonant faith with his co-worker in the task. St. Ambrose, in his treaties on the life of beatitude, speaking of the bondage to which Isaac reduced Esau, his own son, advances the proposition that it was right that Esau should serve a brother more prudent than himself † Error, sir, is the child of Time; truth the offspring of Eternity. Truth, therefore, is ever unchangeable.

The doctrine of the earness guantams of the feet of truth, after a lapse of fifteen hundred years, is the dectrine of those of us who maintain the benefit of the institution for the welfare, moral, physical, and religious, of the African slave. A race, sir, which, for all the contacts of civilization, is marked for the lower reaches of its scale. A race, which, with the pretended blessing of cmancipation, after the trainings of labor had initiated them into a species of elevation, have shown themselves to be so utterly incapable of self-guidance and so ludicrously unfit for self-government, is a race marked by every characteristic which defines strict inferiority. This, sir, is what we, who are the founders and the judges of our own system of society, maintain; this is what the admitted levites of the faith have justified in times past. This is what warrants us in hurling back, upon our traducers, the charge of sin against God; especially when slavery seems so manifestly to be one of the means of his provilential ends. To this view of the question, the doctrine of St. Ambrose is germanely applicable. The enfectment of Esau into his brother Jacob's hand is additionally sustained as coming within the intentions of God; whilst, on the pretended sinfulness of slavery, as a fact exist at in seciety, Ambrose leaves no doubt. With him, as well as with the other dectors, the only bondage is that of sin. The slavery of the body is a condition of human existence, and, as I have already shown from another source of authority, a merely bard estate of life.

But, sir, from whatscever body of authorities, I defy any opponent to show that the keepers and expounders of the primitive faith—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they held the fact of slavery to be a harsh one—though they he trine of those of us who maintain the ber

• Conditionem corporis religious animas genero itas despira. Officiam quidem duram, tamen homini non omoino misocabile, at verò anima capiticas, raiam infolix sel. Tract; to perba, 125, 5.4. Qui imperare non peterat et alterum regere, service desiebat, at à avadentior regeretur. Ambros: de cida benda i lib 2, c. 3.

St. Augustine, in his magnificent conception of the mystic city of God, lays down the theory of slavery with an unfultering hand. Proceeding to argue that the condition of slavery must have been rightfully imposed on sinning man, he concludes that sin was the original cause of bondage. If that he so, sir, then an I justing in having, upon other occasions on this floor, carried its origins to the very threshold of human existence. "Sin," says the great doctor and logician, "is the primal cause of slavery. Whence, man was made subject to man in the hond of its condition, which could not be done, except by the judgment of God, in whom there can be no injustice." And this is not merely his own exposition of the fact; not merely his own conclusions from it, but, like all the other doctors, he rests them, so far as they have any binding power, on the teachings of the Apostles who, he repeats after all his condjutors, commanded the slave to obedience. Nay, who exhorted them if they could not be emancipated by their masters to turn their bodily bondage into spiritual freedom and to serve their masters in good will, until all human principalities and powers shall have passed away, and (tod is all in all! So, Mr. Chairman, according to St. Augustine, who cannot be presumed to have had as much learning or have wielded so powerful an intellect as the Reverend Cheevers, or the equally Reverend Beecher, but who assuredly must be admitted to be as genuine an interpreter of the doctrines of Christ as they can possibly be slavery is the result of the will and judgment of God, in when there is no iniquity. Yet, sir, the Reverend Cheevers and the e-pully Reverend Beecher stand up in their pulpits and virtually damit us for allowing that which He himself instituted by special ordinance for a special perpose! A strange phase of sin, indeed, would that prove, Mr. Chairman, which is faid down by one of the accredited expounders of the Christian faith as the result of a judgment of a God, apual quem non est inequitas—of a God whom it Mr. Chairman, which is laid down by one of the accredited expounders of the Christian faith as the result of a judgment of a God, apud quem non est iniquilas—of a God whom it were blasphemy to submit to our scrutinies or to charge with injustice; yet a God whom our northern friends do not hesitate to arraign, and constructively to condemn, before their own impeccable tribunal! Sir, I do not pretend to be very familiar with the question, as agitated in this special form, by the past expounders of the faith. Indeed, I confess that my inquiries on this ground are of a comparatively recent date. That they have been confined to ascertaining whether, actually and truly, in the opinions and by the teachings of our foreleavers, we are the shocking situates which our loving brethren would have us appear. Confined, sir, to ascertain whether the Charge that "slavery is a sin," made against us of the South, is founded in the testimonics of the carly church; and whether those, many of them indeed, who gave evidence of the true spirit of faith, in the greedy raptures of martyrdom, had really marked us, for centuries and by anticipation, as violators of the law of God, into which our charitable northern friends would pervert us in the sight of the country and of the world! Yes, sir, I confess that beyond that line my investigations have some that they have northern friends would pervert us in the sight of the country and of the world! Yes, sir, I confess that be yond that line my investigation, have scarcely gone; but I am equally bound to feel and to know that they have led me far enough to detect the shallow perensions of our detractors, and to discover the source of much of the accribity, the presumption and intolerance of those who affect the monopoly of moral goodness and religious truth, by virtue of their aurora-borealis system of faith, looking like the true light, yet flashing nothing but error and bile over the northern heavens! Now, do I understand, sir, the true light, yet flashing nothing but error and bile over the northern heavens! Now, do I understand, sir, the true lent ravings—the mad-house blasphemics of an "anti-slavery Scripture and an anti-slavery God?" The fiat of that Scripture, which, in this matter at least, cannot be theirs—for truth and falsehood cannot co-exist—is against their calculated malice; and the very ordinance of the God whom they would impiously shape to their views speaks in condemnation of their arrogant perversions. They bowl against the slaveholder of the South in their very lnability to convict him of sin in owning slaves. Still more fiercely do they howl against us in their impotence "to rail away the scal" from the testament of truth, which, not ranking slavery among the infringements of the law of God, has been handed to us by the early propagators, doctors, and martyrs of the Christian faith to protest against their attempts to wrest its legacies to their own unhallowed ends.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that St. Augustine has laid

It have said, Mr. Chairman, that St. Augustine has laid down the theory of slavery with an unerring hand. It is saying but one-half of what he has done on this head With a precision more marked and telling than anything that characterizes either Pagan or Christian think-

washing the washing the control of t

cante—and by the law of flations—jure gentum—owes obedience to the master; but the master, by the law of grace, owes care, hindness, and charity to his slave. This, Mr. Chairman, laid down with singular precision, constitutes the perfect harmony between the law of God and the law of man in the institution of slavery. It absolves it from all the trumpery charges of the North, and leaves it, as God has made it, a not abnormal element in the organization of society. You have seen that, according to all the pastors of the early church, the master is required to bear with the frowardness and the failings of the slave. That is the law of his Christian duty. But listen to the law of the church under his proprietary rights: 'But if any slave,' 's says the Saint, 'shall, through disobedience, assail the domestic peace of the household, let him be corrected by word or by scourge, or by any other kint of just and lawfal punishment, which human society grants for the good of him, who is corrected in order that he may be reduced to the state of peace from which he had strayed.'' Heaven knows, Mr. Chairman, that, under this rule, and by the discipline of those whem I am compelled, with the consentient opinion of the subordination of the slave and the authority of the master are amply recognised. Bit, for fear of seven hear of manufactual superior manufactual superior and the minediately adds. ter are amply recognised. Bit, for fear of some two fear an ausumicistanting—me acctor immediately adds "Hence it is, that it is the duty of the head of the house

"Hence it is, that it is the douty of the head of the household to apply the precepts of the State, by which he must so govern his household that it shall harmonize with the peace of society." Note, Mr. Chairman, that this is not said of the household in the form of it with which our northern friends are blessed; but, in the household, as, by the old patriarchal rule—by the dispensations of the new law—it exists in our southern homes, under the "precepts of the State," as the bishop terms the laws, which justify the muster's authority. Concluding his argument, on the authority of the father, blending with that of the master, and, on his obligation to rule his household, the doctor subjoins: "Wherefore, as our just fathers"—that, sir, you will please to observe, refers to the old covernant—"as our just fathers is the condition of the harmony of the household that, in so far as concerned these temporal possessions, they made a distinction between the estate of their children and the condition of their slaves; but they provided, with equal

With a precision more marked and telling than anything that characterizes either Pagan or Christian thinker—with a closeness of reasoning more binding than you find in an Epictetus, a Seneca, or a Libanius, he clenches the question with the flat of an anthority which no heathen writer could command. His premises he carries to conclusions which none but the hopelessly ignorant and the wilfully perverse can resist. You have heard him, sir, lay down the proposition that slavery is the consequence of sin rightfully adjudged, and facessarily so, by a God in whom there is, and there can be no injustice. Listen now, sir, both to the logic of the philosopher and the doctrines of the saint. In the sequence of his chained conclusions, he takes issue with our good friends and tells them—not that slavery is sin—but that so soon as sin asserted its power it tainted the freedom of man, and, in so much, introduced slavery. "From this fact, therefore," argues the great doctor, "both the slave and the master may alike derive great advantage; if they shall consider that out of sin grew among men the distinction which marks the domination of the master, and,

the earlier annals of that faith. Comparing God's government on earth and the republic described by Ciecro, he refers to Scipio's definition of a good Commonwealth, and argues against his objection that "it is unjust that the republic should allow slavery." There is the doctor's answer; and let me ask you whether the South may not justly claim it as a vantage-ground of right? "We answer on the part of justice," says the doctor, "that it is equitable on this account, that slavery is useful to some men; and that, when legally practised, it is so to their advantage—namely, when the license of doing mischief is taken away from the savage; for, in a condition of domesticity, they will bear themselves better in proportion as they here themselves worse, when not domesticated. And in order that this reason may be confirmed, we may add a noble example drawn from nature, and ask. Why, therefore, does God control his creature—the soul, the body—and reason, the passions, and other vicious tendencies of the mind? It is plainly evident, from this example, that slavery is beneficial to some."

With this quotation, which I will not weaken by any comment of mine. I close, sir, such authorities as I have deemed apposite, from the works of St. Augustine, to show that, in the year three hundred and fifty, or skry, of the carly Christian era, the guardians of the faith not only did not hold slavery to be a sla, but also maintained that, in instances adduced, it is a positive benefit to some. But as they entirely harmonize with the doctrines of the Greek bishops, I now proceed to complete them by others, drawn from the doctrinal writings of the high-famed Chrysostom, the valiant champion and goldenmonthed orator of the Christianity of the East. Like his great brother of the Latin Church, on all questions of faith, and of course on this of slavery, he goes to the sacred record to inquire into the mandate of the Saviour and the teachings of his Apostles. Like him, he there finds nothing that construes slavery into sin; but, on the soc peritic—trained to every form of human knowledge then attained, and credited as an authoritative expounder of things divine—Chrysostom, with the stern logic of a Demosthenes, embellished by the elegant copiousnesse of a Cicero, has developed every relation, moral, social, pultical, and religious, of the Christian organization. Nothing, sir, was too vast to clude the grasp of his intellect—nothing too minute to escape the searchings of his inquiry. And all of those relations were analyzed and developed in due subordination to the mandates of the Christian faith. Numerous, sir, as are the muniments which we could build up from the teachings of a man who is acknowledged to have had no superior in pagan or Christian antiquity. I must be content to adduce a few authorities only from his writings, and those of a purely and strictly degmatte character. I open the book of those immortal homilies which, if I may so term it, have constituted, unconsciously in many inof a purely and strictly dogmatic character. I open the book of those immortal homilies which, if I may so term it, have constituted, unconsciously in many instances, the stock in trade of successive preachers; and, among the multifarious subjects which they agitate. I find this of slavery, in the Christian sense, handled with an acumen and a rigor unsurpassed. In the outset of his pastoral labors—in his preachings to his flock, preachings widely differing, sir, I am bound to say, from those of our holy brethren of the North to their flocks—I find the learned bishop, in his fifth homily in Genesis, introducing this question of domestic slavery under the Christian dispensation and addressing slaves, not to tell them that their masters are sinners because they hold slaves, but to justify such holding, and to explain to the slaves their duty under the requirements of the Christian law. "This," exclains the maint, "may be said to slaves: Art thou called a slave? Well, why should it concern the? Do you not see that the Apostle shows that slavery is but a nominal thing if you but have the Christian virtues? But, even comit you become free, make a dill better nee of your condition—that is, rather remain in that condition of hondays! And why? Because he who is called a slave, in the truth of the Lord, is the freedman of the Lord!" (St. Chryssotom Home! V.)

condition of bondage! And why? Because he who is called a slave, in the truth of the Lord, is the freedman of the Lord!" (St. Chryssotom Homel V.)

Human laws, Mr. Chairman, may, by legislation, create crimes. I mean that some acts against which there never was a penal sanction may be, and they have been, converted into misdemeanors by the subsequent will of society lawfully expressed. But I am yet to learn, sir, that the case finds a parallel in the divine law, and that human agency can add to or detract from what it has clearly defined under the sanctions of unerring truth. Hence, sir, if the holding of slaves, involving the existence of slavery, was not a sin in the earlier days of Christianity; if the fact of slavery, involving the existence of the master, was not only not a sin, but actually was a condition in which one of the great teachers of spiritual truth exhorted the slave to remain, I am at a loss to account, save on the grounds of malice and perversion, for the late, very late, addition of "slavery sin" which our pious brethren have, in the nineteenth century, made to the catalogue of iniquities, originally defined as violations of the law of God. Some, no doubt, may regret that the great dector and exemplary saint had not the assistance of the profound learning and the benefit of the edifying practices of our modern expositors. Had this been his privilege, he would assuredly have amended his heresics nor would be have so pertinaciously held to his premises. ing practices to du motern exposites. Hat this certain privilege, he would assuredly have amended his heresics nor would he have so pertinaciously held to his premises, exclaiming in their farther development: "Do you not perceive, therefore, that slavery exists as a merely nominal thing, and is freedom in reality? Why else did the Apostle allow you to continue a slave? Why, but that you should be made acquainted with the excellence of spiritual freedom? For, as it is a nucle greater thing, and one worthy of more admiration, to have preserved unscathed the bodies of the three youths in the burning furnace than to have quenched out the flames; so much greater and more admirable is it in the permanence of slavery to give evidence of that freedom than to abolish the slavery! Hence has the Apostle said, although you may have it in your power to be made free, rather avail yourself of the bondage; that is, remain a slave—serves the slavery! Hence has the Apostle said, although you may have it in your power to be mude free, rather avail yourself of the bondage: that is, remain a slave—server menc—for you are in possession of the truest liberty."—(St. Chrysostem, ibid.)

and, wir, both to the lapple of the philosopher and the doctries of the mint. In the sunten of the shall confident the mint. In the sunten of the shall continue the mint. In the superson of the shall continue the shall continue that shavery is sin—but that to soon as it as search its power it similed the freedom of mint, and, in so much, introduced shavery. "From this fact, therefore," superson of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side there were the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side there were the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the side of the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall consider that out of sin grew among men the shall